

Indiana Program Review

PROTOCOL

INDIANA PROGRAM REVIEW

Introduction

The Indiana Program Review Process was jointly developed by the Executive Board of the Indiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (IACTE) and the Division of Professional Standards Teacher Education Committee and approved by the DPS Advisory Board and State Superintendent. This review process is used to examine educator preparation licensure programs at an institution and is conducted two years prior to the institution's accreditation visit by NCATE and/or the state.

This document offers the protocol to colleges and universities for information to be submitted to the state for content program review and how to submit this information online to the IDOE/Division of Educator Licensing/Development.

Approved: September 28, 2006

Content Program Review Process

Following are the step-by-step directions for submission of program documents to the IDOE, Division of Professional Standards. All submissions are to be sent <u>electronically</u>. [The online process for providing documents for review will be explained more in detail later.] These guidelines must be followed in their entirety for <u>each</u> licensure program to be reviewed. The submission date will be posted on the website, and institutions will be reminded of the submission date via email.

Definitions

New Licensure Program is a program that has been approved by the State Superintendent 1-2 years prior to program review. Due to insufficient data, a new program will not be reviewed. Instead, the institution should include in its exhibits for Standard 1 a copy of the "new program approval letter" from the State Superintendent for verification.

<u>Pedagogical Knowledge</u> is the general concepts, theories, and research about effective teaching, regardless of content areas. (NCATE Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, 2001)

<u>Professional Knowledge</u> is the historical, economic, sociological, philosophical, and psychological understandings of schooling and education. It also includes knowledge about learning, diversity, technology, professional ethics, legal and policy issues, pedagogy, and the roles and responsibilities of the profession of teaching. (NCATE Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, 2001)

"Program" is defined as any approved program leading toward <u>original</u> licensure (first time license in the content area). At this time this includes the following programs:

- Business Education
- Building Level Administrator
- Career & Technical Education (by individual program)
- Communication Disorders
- Computer Education
- District Level Administrator
- English as a New Language (including Bilingual Bicultural)
- English/Language Arts
- Exceptional Needs: Mild

Approved: September 28, 2006

- Exceptional Needs: Intense
- Exceptional Needs: Deaf & Hard of Hearing
- Exceptional Needs: Blind & Low Vision
- Fine Arts: Dance
- Fine Arts: Music
- Fine Arts: Theater
- Fine Arts: Visual Arts
- Generalist: Early Childhood (Pre-kindergarten)
- Generalist: Early and Middle Childhood (Kindergarten, Primary & Intermediate Elementary)
- Generalist: Early Adolescence
- Health Education
- High Ability (formerly Gifted & Talented)
- Journalism
- Language Arts
- Library/Media
- Mathematics Education
- Physical Education & Adapted Physical Education
- Reading
- School Counselor
- School Psychologist
- Science (All science licensure areas at your institution will be reviewed as **one** program entitled "Science" effective spring 2009.)
- Social Studies (All social studies licensure areas at your institution will be reviewed as **one** program entitled "Social Studies".)
- Technology Education
- World Languages
- "Program Completer" is a person who has met all of the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program.
- "Teacher Education Course" is defined as a teacher education course required of all candidates (e.g., foundations of education, diversity issues, classroom management, general pedagogy.)
- "Transition-to-Teaching Program" is a <u>delivery</u> system for an approved program. It is not considered a program that is to be reviewed by the state. Because the institution does not prepare T-to-T candidates in the content area, data collected for T-to-T candidates does not need to be included in program review reports.

Approved: September 28, 2006

Programs that will not be reviewed by the state include:

- 1. Programs that have been reviewed by NCATE's Specialty Professional Associations (SPAs)
- 2. Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) programs because the institution evaluates transcripts of a potential MAT candidate for content preparedness in a licensure area and for admission into the MAT program, but does not prepare the candidate in the license content area within the MAT program. The MAT program focuses only on the professional education coursework required for the degree.
- 3. New programs with less than 2 years of data will not be reviewed. A statement regarding the new program status must be included in Document #2.
- 4. A **dormant** program that has had no graduates in the last three years.
- 5. If a program will be closed within <u>one year</u> after the program review date, this program does not need to be reviewed. At the time of the program review, the Division of Educator Licensing/Development will need a letter from the Dean/Chair stating when this program is to be removed from the institution's "Approved Programs" list.

Approved: September 28, 2006 5

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

All program information must be submitted <i>electronically</i> in two MS Word or
PDF documents to

Document #1: "GENERAL PROGRAM OVERVIEW" will include the following:

A. UNIT SUMMARY

Provide a <u>brief</u> description of your teacher education program that will assist the program reviewer in understanding the premise of the unit's program. The summary should include an overview of your conceptual framework, unit assessment system benchmark criteria and any aspects of your program that may be unique and need additional explanation.

B. EDUCATOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION COURSES

Course Descriptions

- a. Submit a listing of educator professional preparation courses and descriptions OR
- b. Submit an online link to a course catalog with direct link to course pages or a listing of those pages.

Be sure to check your institution's "Educator Professional Preparation Courses" section of the document to make certain that it contains all of the professional preparation courses required for your program (e.g., foundations of education, diversity issues, classroom management, general pedagogy course.)

NOTE: This should not include content-specific pedagogy courses which are included in Document #2.

NOTE: These courses are not required of some advanced level programs (e.g., Building Level Administrator, School Counselor, School Psychologist).

Approved: September 28, 2006

C. PROGRAM FIELD EXPERIENCES: a chart showing the relationships among the program's courses and the field experiences provided for all candidates.

Please use this chart format:

Course #/Title or Program Requirement	Purpose of Field Experience	Number of required hours in P-12 classroom	Candidate required tasks

SAMPLE SAMPLE

Approved: September 28, 2006

Document #2: "CONTENT PROGRAM SPECIFICS" will include the following:

A. Content Curriculum Section

1. Submit a copy of the advising sheet (e.g., curriculum guide, program sheet) that describes this program.

2. Course Descriptions

- a. Submit a listing of content courses and descriptions for this content area, OR
- b. Submit an online link to a course catalog with direct link to content course pages or a listing of those pages. (This link should be incorporated into Document #2.)

B. CONTENT Standards Matrix Section

Submit a matrix indicating where all of the Indiana teacher content standards are <u>addressed</u> and the type of assessment used in program courses and field experiences, including assessment evidences. Below is an example of a matrix:

	SAMPLE		SAMPLE	
	Course #321	Course #399	Course	Etc.
			#444	
Standard 1	T 2	Т		
Standard 2	T		T4	
Standard 3		Т	Т	
Etc.				

T = teacher standard addressed

Performance Assessment Examples: (1) test, (2) paper, (3) project, (4) portfolio artifact, (5) labs, (6) lesson plan, (7) teaching, (8) other

C. Assessment Data Section

1. Provide aggregated program assessment data for the last three years. Use the following chart format for presentation of information for each assessment to be reviewed.

8

Approved: September 28, 2006

Sample Assessment Data Document <u>for Teacher Candidates</u>

Program N	Name				
U		-			1.

a 1			•	• . • •
Sample	rocnoucoc	ara	111	1falice
Sumble	responses	uie	uu	uuuus

Element Assessed	Describe the Assessment Activity	When is it assessed?	Title of the Instrument or Rubric (Attach copies)	Aggregated Summary Data for last 3 years	Curriculum/Pro gram/Unit operations modifications made based on this data	Content Standards addressed by this Assessment Activity (Be consistent with #B Standards Matrix)
Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates	1) Praxis II (required of programs where state requires test)	Prior to Student Teaching	Praxis II results	Pass Rate=	Tutoring session implemented in methods courses	DNA
	2) One other content assessment required: Items within the student teaching evaluation	During Student Teaching	Student Teaching Rubric	See Attached Summary	Feedback provided to Arts and Science Faculty	3, 7, 9
D 1 1 1	0	A 7	, n/	4		5.0.0
Pedagogical Content knowledge for Teachers	One assessment activity required: Lesson Plan	At the midpoint benchmk	Lesson Plan Rubric	Avg=	etc	5,8,9
	assessment					
Professional and Pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates	One Assessment activity required: Observation	During student teaching	University Supervisor Observation Form	etc	etc	2,3,4
Student Learning for teacher candidates	One Assessment activity required:	During Student Teaching	Portfolio Rubric	etc	etc	1,5,7
	Results of student reflections in the portfolio					

Sample Assessment Data Document for Other School Personnel Candidates

Program Name	
Sample responses	are in italics

Element Assessed	Describe the Assessment Activity	When is it assessed?	Title of the Instrument or Rubric (Attach copies)	Aggregated Summary Data for last 3 years	Curriculum/Pro gram/Unit operations modifications made based on this data	Content Standards addressed by this Assessment Activity (Be consistent with #B Standards Matrix)
Content Knowledge for Other School Candidates	1)Licensure assessment	End of Program	_	Pass Rate=	Tutoring session implemented during internship	DNA
	2) One other content assessment required: Items within the internship evaluation	During Internship	Internship Rubric	See Attached Summary	Feedback provided to program and education unit	3, 7, 9
Assessment of ability to develop supervisory plan	One assessment activity required: Class Schedule	At the midpoint benchmk	Planning Rubric	Avg=	etc	5,8,9
Assessment of internship/ clinical practice	One Assessment activity required: Observation	During internship	University Supervisor Observation Form	etc	etc	2,3,4
Assessment of ability to support student learning and	One Assessment activity required:	During Internship	Portfolio Rubric	etc	etc	1,5,7
development	Results of reflections in the portfolio					

Actual

Assessment Data Document

Program Name
Program Name

Element Assessed	Describe the Assessment Activity	When is it assessed?	Title of the Instrument or Rubric (Attach copies)	Aggregated Summary Data for last 3 years	Curriculum/Program/ Unit operations modifications made based on this data	Content Standards addressed by this Assessment Activity (Be consistent with #B Standards Matrix)
Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates	1) Praxis II (required of programs where state requires test)		Praxis II results	Pass Rate=		
	2) One other content assessment required:					
Pedagogical	One					
Content knowledge for Teachers	assessment activity required:					
Professional	One					
and Pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates	Assessment activity required:					
Student Learning for teacher candidates	One Assessment activity required:					

1. Please note:

- a. Submit candidate data <u>only</u> for those candidates formally admitted to the teacher education program or candidates who return to add a Rules 2002 license area to an existing Rules 2002 license.
- b. **IMPORTANT**: To maintain privacy of candidates do <u>not</u> submit data linked to specific candidate names or ID numbers.

Approved: September 28, 2006

- 2. Submit assessment instruments and/or scoring guides/rubrics for assessments included on the assessment data descriptions.
- 3. Submit a description (narrative or bulleted format) of how data have been used for specific <u>program</u> changes over the past 3 years. This information may be contained in a "history of change" document.

EXAMPLE:

Assessments in Course # ____ were revised to assure that candidates are assessed on the essential concepts within this course.

4. Submit a summary statement about what your <u>unit</u> has learned relative to your understanding of the aggregated content program assessment data.

EXAMPLE:

Lesson learned: Student teachers were observed making errors in factual information presented to students. A link was established on the student teacher rubric to tie lesson plan objectives to actual content presentation to students by student teacher.

NOTE: If it is preferable to add a "history of change" document as an appendix to your Document #2, you may do so. It would then be necessary to indicate on the Assessment Data Document "See History of Change document at end of Document #2." Highlighting relevant information in the history of change document will assist the program reviewer.

D. Faculty Section

Include a list of content faculty and the program chair responsible for the delivery of the program. This includes all arts & sciences faculty providing the content and/or content specific methods courses and the education faculty providing the methods course(s). Adjuncts teaching content courses should be included in the chart, if they are the sole providers of content or content-specific methods courses. Each faculty person is to be identified by highest degree attained, area of specialization, courses taught in the program, and additional responsibilities related to the program.

Please use this chart format.

Faculty Name	Highest Degree Attained	Area(s) of Specialization	Courses Taught in Program	Additional Responsibility	Years of P-12 Experience
	110001100	Specialization.		in Program	

Approved: September 28, 2006

NOTE:

- a. Although terminal degrees are preferable, there is no required percentage of faculty with terminal degrees.
- b. Similarly, although P-12 experience is preferable, there is no required percentage of faculty with such experience.
- c. Submission of faculty vitae is not required for program review.

Submit all program review documents to:

(The online submission process to be explained at time of submission.)

Approved: September 28, 2006

Content Area Program Review Worksheet

		Submission Date: Institution Name:		
1. To what deg	gree are the state conten	t standards adequately <u>addressed</u> within this program?		
	Great degree	All standards are addressed multiple times in multiple courses.		
	Moderate degree	All standards are addressed, but may not be covered in more than one course.		
_	Minimal degree Not evident	Some standards are addressed within courses. No standards are addressed within courses.		
2. Which, if an	ny, <u>content standards</u> ar	e not sufficiently addressed in the program?		
Comments	Rationale:			
3. To what deg	gree are the state conten	t standards adequately <u>assessed</u> within this program?		
	Great degree	All standards are assessed multiple times in multiple courses.		
	Moderate degree	All standards are assessed, but may not be covered in more than one course.		
_	Minimal degree Not evident	Some standards are assessed within courses. No standards are assessed within courses.		
4. Which, if an	ny, content standards are	e not assessed in the program?		

5. T	To what degree does the program prepare candidates in <u>pedagogical content</u> ?		
		Great degree	Course work prepares candidates very well in these areas.
		Moderate degree	Course work prepares candidates moderately well in these areas.
		Minimal degree	Course work insufficiently prepares candidates in these areas.
		Not evident	Course work does not prepare candidates in these areas.
	To what degreence and the control of		repare candidates in professional and pedagogical
		Great degree	Course work prepares candidates very well in these areas.
		Moderate degree	Course work prepares candidates moderately well in these areas.
		Minimal degree	Course work insufficiently prepares candidates in these areas.
		Not evident	Course work does not prepare candidates in these areas.
		-	rk provide a candidate the content needed to impact P-12 ndiana Academic Standards?
	H	ighly effective	Course work prepares candidates very well to impact P-12 student learning as related to the Indiana Academic Standards.
	M	oderately effective	Course work prepares candidates moderately well to impact P-12 student learning as related to the Indiana Academic Standards.
		omewhat effective	Course work prepares candidates insufficiently to impact P-12 student learning as related to the Indiana Academic Standards.
	N	ot effective	Course work does not prepare candidates to impact P-12 student learning as related to the Indiana Academic Standards.
	Rationale	:	

		resented by the educator preparation program for al comments to share with the program faculty?
	* *	****
	If no, please explain:	
	YES	NO
10. A	re program faculty adequately tr	rained in the content field?
	Rationale:	
9. Do	es the program offer a variety of YES	f field experiences for candidates? NO
	Kationale:	
	Not well qualified Rationale:	Data indicate that 69% or fewer candidates meet all the assessment expectations of the program.
	Somewhat qualified	Data indicate that at least 70% of candidates meet a of the assessment expectations of the program.
	Well qualified	Data indicate that at least 80% of the candidates me all of the assessment expectations of the program.
		all of the assessment expectations of the program.

Next Steps

- A. All documents will be forwarded to three expert program reviewers for scoring on the assigned rubric. The reports will be returned to the Office of Educator Licensing & Development for comparison of reviewer results. In the event that one reviewer's responses are drastically different from the other two, a fourth reviewer will be asked to examine the program.
- B. The program reports will be reviewed and approval determined by the IDOE/Office of Educator Licensing & Development. Then the reports will be sent to the Unit Head within 30 days with an accompanying letter denoting approval status.
- C. For programs APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS, program information will need to be resubmitted to evidence remediation <u>only</u> of those areas that were evaluated as not meeting approval standards. No specific timeline has been established for submission of a rejoinder; however, the ultimate timeline to have these programs approved is by the time of your accreditation visit.
- D. It is suggested that rejoinders be submitted no later than 4-6 months prior to the unit's accreditation visit to assure the Office of Educator Licensure & Development sufficient time to get these materials re-assessed and new status reports written and sent to you in time for the visit.
- E. There is no particular format for rejoinder responses, as each will require programspecific information as indicated by reviewer comments. Rejoinders are to be sent directly to the Assistant Director for Educator Preparation.
- F. In the event that the materials re-submitted for review do <u>not</u> adequately allow for a program to be approved, the unit head will receive a letter of denial of program approval. At this point, no new candidates may be admitted into the program and the program will no longer be approved by the IDOE. <u>The IDOE will discontinue approval of licenses in this area three years from the date of the approved program revocation letter.</u> The unit may submit for approval a new program proposal to the OELD Teacher Education Committee for a revised licensure program.

NOTE: For those programs submitted for SPA review, the same procedures will apply.

Approved: September 28, 2006